



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/909,015	07/20/2001	Kazuhiko Sugawara	35.C15592	9096
5514	7590	06/19/2007		
FITZPATRICK CELLA HARPER & SCINTO 30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA NEW YORK, NY 10112			EXAMINER	
			KANG, PAUL H	
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2144				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
06/19/2007		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/909,015	SUGAWARA, KAZUHIRO	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Paul H. Kang	2144	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 March 2007.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 49-72 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 49-72 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 20 July 2001 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Status of Claims

1. Claims 49-72 are now pending. A detailed action follows.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. **Claims 49-72 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Geiger et al., US Pat. No. 6,073,142, in view of Aronson et al., US Pat. No. 6,654,787.**

4. As to claim 49, Geiger teaches the invention substantially as claimed. Geiger teaches a communication apparatus which is connected to an E-mail server via a network, said communication apparatus comprising (Fig 1,102):

a receiving unit (Fig 3, 282), adapted to receive an E-mail which is to be sent to said communication apparatus stored in a mailbox provided on an E-mail server (Col 11, lines 1-10);

a first obtaining unit (Fig 2, 200), adapted to obtain attribute information of the E-mail stored in the mailbox (Col 3, lines 40-50) (Col 6, lines 20-25) (Col 6, lines 50-60) (Col 10, lines 30-40);

a discriminating unit (Fig 2, 210), adapted to discriminate whether or not to receive the E-mail before said receiving unit receives the E-mail based on the attribute information obtained by said first obtaining unit (Col 10, lines 30-40);

wherein, in a case where said discriminating unit discriminated to receive the E-mail, said receiving unit receives the E-mail that said discriminating unit discriminated to receive, and in a case where said discriminating unit discriminates not to receive the E-mail, said receiving unit does not receive the E-mail that said discriminating unit has discriminated not to receive (Col 7, lines 1-10); and

wherein said discriminating unit further discriminates whether or not to receive an E-mail other than the E-mail that said discriminating unit has discriminated not to receive (Col 10, lines 30-40).

However, Geiger does not explicitly teach a discriminating unit, adapted to discriminate whether or not to receive the E-mail stored in the mail box before said receiving unit receives the E-mail from the E-mail server, based on the attribute information. In the same field of endeavor, Aronson teaches a system and method for filtering emails comprising a discriminating unit, adapted to discriminate whether or not to receive the E-mail stored in the mail box before said receiving unit receives the E-mail from the E-mail server, based on the attribute information (Aronson, col. 4, line 35 – col. 5, line 19 and col. 5, lines 22-67).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to have incorporated the email server mailbox filtering as taught by Aronson into the email filtering system of Geiger for the purpose of decreasing network traffic and filter efficiency.

5. As to claims 50 and 59, Geiger-Aronson teaches the communication apparatus further comprising a controlling unit (Fig 2, 230), adapted to, in a case where said discriminating unit discriminated not to receive the Email, send to the E-mail server an instruction for deleting from the mail box the E-mail that said discriminating unit discriminated not to receive, and to delete E-mails after the receiving unit receives that E-mail (Fig 4,422) (Col 10, lines 50-55).

6. As to claim 51, Geiger-Aronson teaches a communication apparatus wherein said first obtaining unit obtains size information of the E-mail as the attribute information, and said discriminating unit discriminates whether or not to receive the E-mail based on the obtained size information (Col 3, lines 40-50) (Col 10, lines 30-40).

7. As to claim 52, Geiger teaches a communication apparatus further comprising a second obtaining unit, adapted to obtain maximum value information of a size of the E-mail capable of being received by said receiving unit (Col 3, lines 40-50), wherein said discriminating unit discriminates whether or not to receive the E-mail by comparing the size information of the E-mail obtained by said first obtaining unit with the maximum value information obtained by said second obtaining unit (Col 3, lines 40-50) (Col 10, lines 30-40).

8. In claim 53, Geiger-Aronson teaches a communication apparatus wherein said controlling unit receives only header information of the E-mail that said discriminating unit discriminates not to receive, and stores, as communication history information, information obtained from the received header information (Col 3, lines 40-50) (Col 17, lines 15-25) (Col 23, lines 1-5). Discrimination that is made base on sender is extracted from the source address of the header.

9. In claim 54, Geiger teaches about a communication apparatus wherein said controlling unit stores as communication history information the size information of the E-mail that said discriminating unit discriminates not to receive (Fig 14) (Col 10, lines 50-55) (Col 23, lines 1-5).

10. In claim 55, Geiger-Aronson teaches about a communication apparatus according to Claim 23, wherein said controlling unit stores as communication history information a fact that the reception by said receiving unit to the E-mail that said discriminating unit discriminates not to receive is stopped (Fig 14) (Col 10, lines 50-55) (Col 23, lines 1-5).

11. In claim 56, Geiger-Aronson teaches about a communication apparatus wherein said controlling unit stores as communication history information a fact that the E-mail that said discriminating unit discriminates not to receive is deleted (Fig 14) (Col 10, lines 50-55) (Col 23, lines 1-5).

12. In claim 57, Geiger teaches about a communication apparatus wherein, in a case where said receiving unit receives the E-mail that said discriminating unit discriminates to receive, said controlling unit stores as communication history information the information obtained from the E-mail received by said receiving unit (Fig 14) (Col 10, lines 50-55) (Col 23, lines 1-5).

13. In claim 58, Geiger-Aronson teaches about a communication apparatus further comprising an output unit, adapted to, in a case where said receiving unit receives the E-mail that said discriminating unit discriminates to receive, output the E-mail received by said receiving unit (Col 10, lines 50-55).

14. Claims 60-70 are the methods to the apparatus of claims 49-59 respectively, and are rejected under the same rationale as claims 49-59.

15. Claim 71 is the program for causing a computer to execute the apparatus of claim 49 is rejected for the same reason as claim 49.

16. Claim 72 is the computer-readable storage medium which stores a program used by a computer to execute the method of the apparatus of claim 49 is rejected for the same reason as claim 49.

17. In claim 47, Geiger-Aronson teaches about a communication apparatus according to

Claim 23, wherein, said controlling unit sends to said E-mail server an instruction for deleting from the mail box the E-mail that said discriminating unit discriminated to receive (i.e. forwarding), after said receiving unit receives the E-mail that said discriminating unit discriminated to receive (Col 10, lines 50-60).

18. In claim 48, Geiger-Aronson teaches about a communication method according to Claim 34, wherein, said controlling step includes sending to said E-mail server an instruction for deleting from the mail box the E-mail that said discriminating step discriminated to receive (i.e. forwarding), after the Email that said discriminating unit discriminated to receive is received in said receiving step (Col 10, lines 50-60).

Response to Arguments

19. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 49-72 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. Applicants argued in substance that the prior art does not teach or suggest discriminating the emails for retrieval at the server, prior to receipt by the client. The new grounds of rejection teaches this feature.

Conclusion

20. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

21. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Paul H. Kang whose telephone number is (571) 272-3882. The examiner can normally be reached on 9 hour flex. First Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William Vaughn can be reached on (571) 272-3922. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Paul H. Kang/
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2144